

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

John W. Miller,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No.: 6:11-cv-210-TLW-KFM
)	
Rosemary Sanders, Sgt. Officer;)	
Paula Brodie, Nurse,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

ORDER

On January 31, 2011, the plaintiff, John W. Miller (“plaintiff”), proceeding pro se, filed this civil action. (Doc. # 1). The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2), DSC.

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. # 52). On December 13, 2011, the Magistrate Judge issued the Report. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court grant the defendants’ motions for summary judgment (Docs. 25, 35) and decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over any claims asserted pursuant to state law. (Doc. # 52). The plaintiff filed no objections to the Report. Objections were due on January 3, 2012.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. §

636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 52). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the defendants' motions for summary judgment (Docs. 25, 35) are **GRANTED**, and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c), this Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over any claims the plaintiff asserts pursuant to state law. In light of these rulings, this case is **DISMISSED** in its entirety.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

January 25, 2012

Florence, South Carolina